### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment new claims 19-26 are added.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering and initialing the references cited in the IDS of October 4, 2005. Applicant submits that a typographical error was made in Form 1449 which lists the second U.S. Patent as "US 5,125,042 (patent family member of US 5125042)." U.S. Patent 5,125,042 is a patent family member of WO 9016035, not US 5125042. Therefore, the correct parenthetical information is "US 5,125,042 (patent family member of WO 9016035)." The WO reference was also filed on October 4, 2005.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sasaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0105016A1; hereinafter "Sasaki"). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Patent No. 5,381,163; hereinafter "Yokoyama"). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Shiraiwa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0162695A1; hereinafter "Shiraiwa"). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Ohta (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0051230 A1; hereinafter "Ohta") and further in view of Redd *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0190400 A1; hereinafter "Redd"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Redd. Claims 7-12 are rejected for reasons similar to those presented for claims 1-6. Claims 13-18 are rejected for reasons similar to those presented for claims 1-6. Applicant submits the arguments below in traversal of the claim rejections.

## Rejection of Claims 1 and 3 under § 102(e) by Sasaki

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable because each and every element of the claim is not disclosed or suggested by Sasaki. Claim 1 recites:

 A method of processing images, wherein inputted image data is subjected to image processes and the processed image data is outputted, comprising the steps of sequentially dividing inputted image data into small blocks of image data, each having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process to be performed,

sequentially performing an image process on said small blocks of image data to sequentially obtain small blocks of processed image data,

and sequentially outputting said small blocks of processed image data to an output destination.

For example, Sasaki fails to disclose or suggest sequentially dividing inputted image data into small blocks of image data, each having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process to be performed, in combination with other elements of the claim. In the Office Action, the Examiner points out claim 27 of Sasaki as corresponding to the step of sequentially dividing inputted image data, and points out the real time processing unit 23 depicted in Fig. 3 as disclosing the step of sequentially performing an image process.

Claim 27 of Sasaki and Fig. 3, however, do not show having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process to be performed. Rather, claim 27 merely discloses having a line memory storing a predetermined number of pixel data per line, storing image in frame units to be provided from the image pickup device, and dividing horizontally an image in frame units. None of these recitations of claim 27 in Sasaki is related to any sort of image

process to be performed. For example, there is no relationship between the size of the line memory, the predetermined number of pixels, frame unit size and the image that is divided horizontally in frame units with a image process.

Likewise, Fig. 3 only shows a single processing block 41 which is does not allow for having a data volume according to the characteristics of an image process to be performed.

Rather, the single processing block 41 processes pixels in a *fixed* pixel by pixel manner that does not take into account any characteristics of any image process.

Claim 3, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1.

#### Rejection of Claim 2 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Yokoyama

Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Yokoyama fails to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

#### Rejection of Claim 4 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Shiraiwa

Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Shiraiwa fails to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

Rejection of Claim 5 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Ohta and further in view of Redd

Claim 5, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Ohta and Redd fail to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

# Rejection of Claim 6 under § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Redd

Claim 6, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Redd fail to make up for the deficiencies of Sasaki.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 U.S. APPLN NO. 10/078,499

The remaining claims 7-18 are patentable for at least the reasons similar to those

submitted for claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 2, 2006

12